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Reviewer's report:

This paper is about expectations of an EPR, not about how it turned out. It is always more useful to see how well things worked, not just how well they are expected to work. For example, there is quite a lot about potential adaptation, but what really matters is what needs to be adapted and what is adapted. Adaptation often creates problems as well as benefits. This adaptation may include changes to the EPR or to supporting arrangements or job roles.

The site and system are deliberately anonymous, but it would be more interesting if both were specified, especially in an open access journal. Can this be reconsidered? There is little if anything here that is potentially sensitive.

Introduction. The NPfIT deserves no credit for the implementation of GP computing, which was achieved in the 1990s. See for example, Benson T. Why General Practitioners Use Computers and Hospital Doctors Do Not, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.325.7372.1086 and https://www.bmj.com/content/325/7372/1090.1. These papers were originally written as advice to NPfIT. Given that NPfIT spent £12Bn or more, describing expenditure of for example £0.5Bn as being costly seems to be out of context. This paragraph needs to be re-written.

I would not describe a report written before 2014 as being recent. It is not clear which reference is the review.

I am a fan of Greenhalgh's NASSS framework which encompasses much of NPT (ref 43). I would like it to have been explored more. There is no reference to Greenhalgh's contention that complexity (at multiple levels) is the core problem. This paper is focused on the concerns of clinical users, which is only one level (users) of Greenhalgh's seven.

I would have expected NPT to be referenced at first mention. NPT focuses on the work that people do, but this paper focuses on what people think they will need to do. This distinction needs to be discussed. This paper is heavily focused on the NHS. International audiences need to be considered. To what extent is the measurement framework based on NoMAD or the NPT implementation toolkit? NPT is a useful tool, but it covers only some aspects of innovation. It might be helpful to mention digital confidence, innovativeness, user experience, behaviour change and so on. See for example https://informatics.bmj.com/content/26/1/e000018
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